APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,476	04/06/2001	Motoki Ide	P/2291-100	6147

		EXAMINER
7590	09/23/2004	HUYNH, THU V

Steven I. Weisburd
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP
1177 Avenue of Americas
41st floor
New York, NY 10036-2714

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/827,476	IDE ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Thu V Huynh	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 April 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☒ All　b)☐ Some *　c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: IDS filed on 04/23/03 to application filed

on 04/06/2001 which has provisional filed on 04/07/2000.

2.   Claims 1-13 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 7 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making
> and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it
> pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode
> contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4.   Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with

the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in

the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with

which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Regarding "FIRST EMBODIMENT", Applicant has stated that "When the magic number

of WML is not detected (NO at step S42), it is further determined whether the magic number of

GIF file or EXE file is selected as in the case of the magic number of WML. When the magic

number of the GIF file or EXE file is detected from the first characters of the received content,

the received content is output to the HTML parser" (Specification, page 20, line 2-7), "Although

GIF file or EXE file is processed in the HTML parser 35 in this case, a dedicate parser can be

provided, and this statement indicates that the invention is different from what is defined in the

claim(s) because:

Regarding dependent claim 9, the user of "when it is determined that the obtained content data is described in the predetermined information description language, parsing the obtained content data based on description of the predetermined information description language to produce the displaying information; and when it is determined that the obtained content data is not described in the predetermined information description language, parsing the obtained content data based on discriminated content type of the obtained content data" is unclear since:

First, if the document type is not described in predetermined information description language (HTML or WML), the feature of "parsing the document based on discriminated content type of the obtained content data" can not be occurred, since basing on Application's specification, HTML parser (predetermined information description language) is used to parse the document.

Second, if the document type is not described in predetermined information description language (HTML or WML), the feature of "parsing the document based on discriminated content type of the obtained content data" can not be occurred, since basing on Application's specification, "a dedicated parser", can not parsed a document because the parser type and the document type is not the same.

Finally, if the document type is not described in predetermined information description language (HTML or WML), the features of "parsing the document based on discriminated content type of the obtained content data" and "parsing the document based on description of the predetermined information description language" are the same, since the system always provide appropriate parser based on document content type.

Regarding dependent claim 10, the user of and "when it is determined that the code is

text data, parsing the obtained content data based on description of a predetermined information

description language to produce the displaying information; and when it is determined that the

code is not text data, parsing the obtained content data based on discriminated content type of the

obtained content data" is unclear since:

First, the claim limitation cannot find in the specification. Regarding to the "THIRD

EMBODIMENT" in Applicant's specification, which discloses Applicants' invention

implementation when the code is text data or not.

Second, even though applying the first embodiment into third embodiment, if the code is

not text data, the feature of "parsing the document based on discriminated content type of the

obtained content data" can not be occurred, since basing on Application's specification, HTML

parser (predetermined information description language) is used to parse the document.

Second, if the code is not text data, the feature of "parsing the document based on

discriminated content type of the obtained content data" can not be occurred, since basing on

Application's specification, "a dedicated parser", can not parsed a document because the parser

type and the document type is not the same.

Finally, if the code is not text data, the features of parsing the obtained content data based

on description of a predetermined information description language; and "parsing the document

based on discriminated content type of the obtained content data" are the same, since the system

always provide appropriate parser based on document content type.

5.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 9 –10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention. Evidence that claims 9-10 fail to correspond in scope with that which applicant(s) regard as the invention can be found in Application specification. In that paper, applicant has stated that "When the magic number of WML is not detected (NO at step S42), it is further determined whether the magic number of GIF file or EXE file is selected as in the case of the magic number of WML. When the magic number of the GIF file or EXE file is detected from the first characters of the received content, the received content is output to the HTML parser" (Specification, page 20, line 2-7), "Although GIF file or EXE file is processed in the HTML parser 35 in this case, a dedicate parser can be provided, and this statement indicates that the invention is different from what is defined in the claim(s) because:

Regarding dependent claim 9, the user of "when it is determined that the obtained content data is described in the predetermined information description language, parsing the obtained content data based on description of the predetermined information description language to produce the displaying information; and when it is determined that the obtained content data is not described in the predetermined information description language, parsing the obtained content data based on discriminated content type of the obtained content data" is unclear since:

First, if the document type is not described in predetermined information description language (HTML or WML), the feature of "parsing the document based on discriminated content

type of the obtained content data" can not be occurred, since basing on Application's specification, HTML parser (predetermined information description language) is used to parse the document.

Second, if the document type is not described in predetermined information description language (HTML or WML), the feature of "parsing the document based on discriminated content type of the obtained content data" can not be occurred, since basing on Application's specification, "a dedicated parser", can not parsed a document because the parser type and the document type is not the same.

Finally, if the document type is not described in predetermined information description language (HTML or WML), the features of "parsing the document based on discriminated content type of the obtained content data" and "parsing the document based on description of the predetermined information description language" are the same, since the system always provide appropriate parser based on document content type.

Regarding dependent claim 10, the user of and "when it is determined that the code is text data, parsing the obtained content data based on description of a predetermined information description language to produce the displaying information; and when it is determined that the code is not text data, parsing the obtained content data based on discriminated content type of the obtained content data" is unclear since:

First, the claim limitation cannot find in the specification. Regarding to the "THIRD EMBODIMENT" in Applicant's specification, which discloses Applicants' invention implementation when the code is text data or not.

Second, even though applying the first embodiment into third embodiment, if the code is

not text data, the feature of "parsing the document based on discriminated content type of the

obtained content data" can not be occurred, since basing on Application's specification, HTML

parser (predetermined information description language) is used to parse the document.

Second, if the code is not text data, the feature of "parsing the document based on

discriminated content type of the obtained content data" can not be occurred, since basing on

Application's specification, "a dedicated parser", can not parsed a document because the parser

type and the document type is not the same.

Finally, if the code is not text data, the features of parsing the obtained content data based

on description of a predetermined information description language; and "parsing the document

based on discriminated content type of the obtained content data" are the same, since the system

always provide appropriate parser based on document content type.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
manner in which the invention was made.

(b) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35
U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the
time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the
obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly
owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35
U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. **Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Chu-Carroll</u> et al., US 2003/0212686 A1, provisional filed 03/17/2000 and in view of <u>Halahmi</u>, US 6,684,088 B1, filed 03/01/2000.**

Regarding independent claim 1, Chu-Carroll teaches the steps of:

a) a content obtainer for obtaining content data from a desired content server via a network (Chu-Carroll, page 4, paragraphs 53 and 65-66; obtaining a document from a server; examining the document to identify the document type);

b) a content-type discriminator for discriminating a content type of the obtained content data from a plurality of predetermined content types (Chu-Carroll, page 3, paragraph 48 and page 4, paragraphs 66-67 and claim 33; determining the document type to locate a parser that corresponding associated with the document from plurality of parsers. This inherently disclose that many predetermined content types must be included in order to identify a document type);

c) a plurality of parsers corresponding to respective ones of the plurality of predetermined content types, wherein the obtained content data is parsed by a corresponding parser depending on a discrimination result of the step (b) to produce displaying information (Chu-Carroll, page 4, paragraphs 53 and 66-67; and claim 36; parsing the document based on the document type to translate the document into a new document in a suitable data structure);

Chu-Carroll does not explicitly disclose parsing the document to produce displaying information and displaying an obtained content based on the displaying information.

Halahmi teaches the steps of:

- parsing an obtained content data depending on a discrimination result of the step (b) to produce displaying information (Halahmi, col.8, lines 16-18 ; col.9, lines 1-13; 43-60; col.11, lines 1-11 and 21-25; col.13, lines 4-7; parsing a document depending on the type of the document, such as, text, image, HTML, video, or WML type to produce display attributes);

- a display section for displaying an obtained content based on the displaying information (Halahmi, col.13, lines 4-7).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Halahmi's parsing method into Chu-Carroll to translate a document into a suitable document as Chu-Carroll disclosed in paragraph 53, as well as a document in WML structure that can be displayed on a small device.

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1. Halahmi teaches wherein the plurality of predetermined content types are determined by respective ones of information description languages having no compatibility with each other" is included (Halahmi, col.8, lines 16-18 and 30-32; col.9, lines 1-13 and 43-60; and col.11, lines 1-11 and 21-25; portion server parses the header information to identify different content types, such as text, image, TIFF, HTML, video or WML).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Halahmi's parsing method into Chu-Carroll to translate any document type into a suitable document as Chu-Carroll disclosed in paragraphs 53, 71 and 140, as well as in a WML structure that can be displayed on a small device.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Halahmi teaches wherein the

information description language include HTML (Hypertext Markup Language) and WML

(Wireless Markup Language) (Halahmi, col.8, lines 16-18 and 30-32; col.9, lines 1-13 and 43-60;

and col.11, lines 1-11 and 21-25; portion server parses the header information to identify different

content types, such as text, image, TIFF, HTML, video or WML).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have combined Halahmi's parsing method into Chu-Carroll to translate any document

type including a WML type into a suitable document as Chu-Carroll disclosed in paragraphs 53, 71

and 140.

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Chu-Carroll teaches wherein the

content-type discriminator discriminates a content type of the obtained content data by refereeing

to a code arranged at a predetermined location of the obtained content data (Chu-Carroll, page 4,

paragraphs 66-68, finding a marker at the first few lines of the document or top-level tag to

identify the document type).

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Halahmi teaches wherein the content-

type discriminator discriminates a content type of the obtained content data by refereeing to a

content-type indicating code included in a protocol header of the obtained content data (Halahmi,

col.8, lines 16-18 and 30-32; col.9, lines 1-13 and 43-60; and col.11, lines 1-11 and 21-25; portion

server parses the protocol header for information to identify different content types, such as text, image, TIFF, HTML, video or WML).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Halahmi's teaching into Chu-Carroll to identify a type of any document, such as HTML or XML, since the combination would have provides many techniques are used to identify the document type when either one of the techniques can not verify the document type.

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Chu-Carroll teaches wherein the content-type discriminator discriminates a content type of the obtained content data by refereeing to a code arranged at a predetermined location of the obtained content data (Chu-Carroll, page 4, paragraphs 66-68, finding a marker at the first few lines of the document or top-level tag to identify the document type).

Halahmi teaches wherein the content-type discriminator discriminates a content type of the obtained content data by refereeing to a content-type indicating code included in a protocol header of the obtained content data (Halahmi, col.8, lines 16-18 and 30-32; col.9, lines 1-13 and 43-60; and col.11, lines 1-11 and 21-25; portion server parses the protocol header for information to identify different content types, such as text, image, TIFF, HTML, video or WML).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Halahmi's teaching into Chu-Carroll to identify a type of any document, such as HTML or XML, since the combination would have provides many

techniques are used to identify the document type when either one of the techniques can not

verify the document type.

Regarding independent claim 7, Chu-Carroll teaches the steps of:

d) obtaining content data from a desired content server via a network (Chu-Carroll, page

4, paragraphs 53 and 65-66; obtaining a document from a server; examining the

document to identify the document type);

e) discriminating a content type of the obtained content data from a plurality of

predetermined content types (Chu-Carroll, page 3, paragraph 48 and page 4, paragraphs

66-67 and claim 33; determining the document type to locate a parser that

corresponding associated with the document from plurality of parsers. This inherently

disclose that many predetermined content types must be included in order to identify a

document type);

f) parsing the obtained content data depending on a discrimination result of the step (b) to

produce a new document (Chu-Carroll, page 4, paragraphs 53 and 66-67; and claim 36;

parsing the document based on the document type to translate the document into a new

document in a suitable data structure);

Chu-Carroll does not explicitly disclose parsing the document to produce displaying

information and displaying an obtained content based on the displaying information.

Halahmi teaches the steps of:

- parsing an obtained content data depending on a discrimination result of the step (b) to

produce displaying information (Halahmi, col.8, lines 16-18 ; col.9, lines 1-13; 43-60;

col.11, lines 1-11 and 21-25; col.13, lines 4-7; parsing a document depending on the

type of the document, such as, text, image, HTML, video, or WML type to produce

display attributes);

- displaying an obtained content based on the displaying information (Halahmi, col.13,

lines 4-7).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have combined Halahmi's parsing method into Chu-Carroll to translate the document

into a suitable document as Chu-Carroll disclosed in paragraph 53, as well as a document in WML

structure that can be displayed on a small device.

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Chu-Carroll teaches wherein the

step(b) comprises the steps of:

b.1)   storing a plurality of unique codes each indicating the plurality of predetermined

content types (Chu-Carroll, page 4, paragraphs 66-67 and claim 33; determining

the document type to locate a parser that corresponding associated with the

document from plurality of parsers. This inherently discloses that many

predetermined content types must be stored in order to identify a document type

and corresponding associated parser);

b2.)   searching the plurality of unique codes for a code arranged at a predetermined

location of the obtained content data to discriminate the content type of the

obtained content data (Chu-Carroll, page 4, paragraphs 66-68, finding a marker at

the first few lines of the document or top-level tag to identify the document type).

Chu-Carroll teaches many ways to identify the content type of the document, such as using schemas, top-level tag. However, Chu-Carroll does not explicitly disclose the step:

b.3) when no match is found in step (b.2), checking a content type indicating code included in a protocol header of the obtained content data to discriminate the content type of the obtained content data.

Halahmi teaches the steps of:

- checking a content type indicating code included in a protocol header of the obtained content data to discriminate the content type of the obtained content data (Halahmi, col.8, lines 16-18 and 30-32; col.9, lines 1-13 and 43-60; and col.11, lines 1-11 and 21-25; portion server parses the protocol header for information to identify different content types, such as text, image, TIFF, HTML, video or WML).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Halahmi's teaching into Chu-Carroll to identify a type of any document, such as HTML or XML, since the combination would have provides many techniques are used to identify the document type when either one of the techniques can not verify the document type.

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 7, Chu-Carroll teaches wherein said discriminating step comprises the steps of:

b.1) storing a plurality of unique codes each indicating the plurality of predetermined content types storing a plurality of unique codes each indicating the plurality of predetermined content types (Chu-Carroll, page 4, paragraphs 66-67 and claim

33; determining the document type to locate a parser that corresponding

associated with the document from plurality of parsers. This inherently discloses

that many predetermined content types must be stored in order to identify a

document type and corresponding associated parser);

b.3)   searching the plurality of unique codes for a code arranged at a predetermined

location of the obtained content data to discriminate the content type of the

obtained content data (Chu-Carroll, page 4, paragraphs 66-68, finding a marker at

the first few lines of the document or top-level tag to identify the document type);

and the step (c) comprises the step of:

c.1)   when it is determined that the obtained content data is described in the

predetermined information description language, parsing the obtained

content data based on description of the predetermined information

description language to produce the displaying information (Chu-Carroll,

page 4, paragraphs 66-67 and claim 33); and

c.2)   when it is determined that the obtained content data is not described in the

predetermined information description language, parsing the obtained

content data based on the discriminated content data type of the obtained

content data (Chu-Carroll, page 4, paragraphs 66-67 and claim 33; refer to

35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs, Chu-Carroll teaches providing a

corresponding parser based on any document content type).

Chu-Carroll does not explicitly disclose checking a protocol header of the obtained

content data to determine whether the obtained content data is described in a predetermined

information description language and when it is determined that the obtained content data is not

described in the predetermined information description language, parsing the obtained content

data based on the discriminated content data type of the obtained content data

Halahmi teaches the steps of:

-    checking a content type indicating code included in a protocol header of the obtained

content data to discriminate the content type of the obtained content data (Halahmi,

col.8, lines 16-18 and 30-32; col.9, lines 1-13 and 43-60; and col.11, lines 1-11 and 21-

25; portion server parses the protocol header for information to identify different

content types, such as text, image, TIFF, HTML, video or WML).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Halahmi's teaching into Chu-Carroll to identify a type of

any document, such as HTML or XML, since the combination would have provides many

techniques are used to identify the document type when either one of the techniques can not

verify the document type.

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Chu-Carroll teaches wherein said

discriminating step comprises the steps of:

a)   storing a plurality of unique codes each indicating the plurality of predetermined

content types (Chu-Carroll, page 4, paragraphs 66-67 and claim 33; determining the

document type to locate a parser that corresponding associated with the document from

plurality of parsers. This inherently discloses that many predetermined content types

must be stored in order to identify a document type and corresponding associated

parser);

b) when it is determined that the code is not text data, parsing the obtained content data

based on discriminated content type of the obtained content data (Chu-Carroll, page 4,

paragraphs 66-67 and claim 33; refer to 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs,

Chu-Carroll teaches providing a corresponding parser based on any document content

type).

Gillon teaches the steps of:

- checking a code arranged at a predetermined location of the obtained content data to

determined whether the code is text data (Gillon, col.5, lines 38-67 and col.7, lines 3-

9; identifying the content type, such as "text/HTML" by matching the code in a

protocol header of the obtained content data with predetermined types);

- when it is determined that the code is not text data, searching the plurality of unique

codes for a code arranged at a predetermined location of the obtained content data to

discriminate the content type of the obtained content data (Gillon, col.5, lines 38-67

and col.7, lines 3-9; identifying the content type by matching the code in a protocol

header of the obtained content data with predetermined types. This inherently

discloses that the predetermined types must be stored in order matching process).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Gillon's text/HTML type into Chu-Carroll and Halahmi to

identify a type of a document, since the combination would have provided many predetermined

document/content types for translating into a new document besides XML document as Chu-

Carroll disclosed, as well Halahmi disclosed when it is determined that the code is text data,

parsing the obtained content data based on description of the predetermined information

description language to produce the display information (Halahmi, col.9, lines 1-13; 43-60; col.11,

lines 1-11 and 21-25; col.13, lines 4-7; parsing a document depending on the type of the document,

such as, text, image, HTML, video, or WML type to produce display attributes).

8.   **Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Chu-</u>**

<u>Carroll in view of Halahmi</u> as applied to claims 7 and 9-10 above, and further in view of

<u>Gillon</u> et al., US 5,838,927, filed 11/1996.

Regarding claim 11, which is dependent on claim 7, Gillon teaches wherein the said

discriminating step comprises the steps of:

   a) storing a plurality of file name extensions used in predetermined communication

      protocol, each of the file name extensions indicating the plurality of predetermined

      content types (Gillon, col.7, lines 3-9; identifying the content type by matching the file

      extension of the obtained file with predetermined types. This inherently discloses that

      the predetermined types must be stored in order matching process); and

   b) searching the plurality of file name extensions for a file name extension of the obtained

      content data to discriminate the content type of the obtained content data (Gillon, col.5,

      lines 38-67 and col.7, lines 3-9; identifying the content type by matching the file

      extension of the obtained file with predetermine types. This inherently discloses

      searching process must be occurred in order matching the file extension of the obtained

      file with predetermine types).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Gillon's teaching into Chu-Carroll to identify a type of a

document, since the combination would have provided many techniques are used to identify the

document type when either one of the techniques can not verify the document type.

Regarding claim 12, which is dependent on claim 9, Gillon teaches wherein the

predetermined information description language is one of HTML (Hypertext Markup Language)

and compact HTML that is a subset of the HTML (Gillon, col.5, lines 38-67 and col.7, lines 3-9).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have combined Gillon's text/HTML type into Chu-Carroll and Halahmi to identify a

type of a document, since the combination would have provided many predetermined

document/content types for translating into a new document besides XML document as Chu-

Carroll disclosed, as well Halahmi disclosed many other type of documents (Halahmi, col.9, lines

1-13; 43-60; col.11, lines 1-11 and 21-25; col.13, lines 4-7; type of the document, such as, text,

image, HTML, video, or WML type).

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent on claim 10, wherein the predetermined

information description language is one of HTML (Hypertext Markup Language) and compact

HTML that is a subset of the HTML (Gillon, col.5, lines 38-67 and col.7, lines 3-9).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have combined Gillon's text/HTML type into Chu-Carroll and Halahmi to identify a

type of a document, since the combination would have provided many predetermined

document/content types for translating into a new document besides XML document as Chu-Carroll disclosed, as well Halahmi disclosed many other type of documents (Halahmi, col.9, lines 1-13; 43-60; col.11, lines 1-11 and 21-25; col.13, lines 4-7; type of the document, such as, text, image, HTML, video, or WML type).

Conclusion

9.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kessenick et al., US 6,292,802 B1, filed 12/1997, teaches method for using web browser to search large collections of documents.

Tso et al., US 6,421,733 B1, filed 10/1997, teaches dynamically transcoding data transmitted between computers.

Stone et al., US 6,101,510, filed 01/1997, teaches web browser control for incorporating web browser functionality into application program.

Anderson et al., US 5,745,908, filed 03/1996, teaches method for converting a word processing file containing markup language tags and conventional computer code.

Demopoulos et al., US 2004/0143792 A1, filed 03/2000, teaches redline extensible markup language schema.

Jones et al., US 6,415,307 B2, filed 03/1998, teaches publication file conversion and display.

Souder et al., US 5,724,556, filed 04/1995, teaches method for defining and configuring modules of data objects and program in a distributed computer system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Thu V Huynh whose telephone number is (571) 273-4126. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen S Hong can be reached on (571) 273-4124. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TVH
September 20, 2004

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER